

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.unpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,932	07/21/2006	Else Marie Celine Defoor	10556.204-US	1922
25908 NOVOZYME	7590 05/28/200 S NORTH AMERICA.	EXAM	EXAMINER	
500 FIFTH A		DUFFY, PATRICIA ANN		
SUITE 1600 NEW YORK,	NY 10110	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		1645		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/28/2000	EL ECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patents-US-NY@novozymes.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/586,932	DEFOOR ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Patricia A. Duffy	1645	

	Patricia A. Duffy	1645					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATI	ON IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWA	NCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b)    The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire le Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or [MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 766.07())	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the polition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension is under corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension are set for the final extension and the feel of the feel							
2. A The Notice of Appeal was filed on 21 May 2009. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
<ol> <li>∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because         <ul> <li>(a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) ∑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> </ul> </li> </ol>							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1			OTOL 204)				
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (	-1 OL-324).				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	planation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>37-60</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>61-82</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	to provide a				
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12.  Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
	/Patricia A. Duffy/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1645					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the proposed amendment now requires the gene to be present in an auxilophycic cell which lacked unity of invention. As such the claims are now drawn to a different invention that was withdrawn in the final rejection and therefore would def acto require new search and consideration. The search and consideration may also extend to groups not previously examined in the final rejection based on a potential reionider.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the rejections are maintained for reasons made of record since the claims still encompass variability at the nucleic acid level that does not encode the orotate transporter described in the specification. Applicants amendment does not obviate the written description rejection and the rejection is maintained for reasons made of record, while the skill in the art is high, Applicants define their transporter as pioneering as such the need for description is more and not less in a pioneering invention. Applicants have not provided sufficient description to correlate the structure of the nucleic acid with function of transport. The skilled artisan could not envision where changes could be made and still have a nucleic acid encoding a protien having the recited function. Applicants relicance on the written description guidelines is missplaced as the combination of structure and function is not set forth in the specification as filed. Applicants are directed to Ex parte Kubin. The rejection is maintained. With respect to the 102(b) rejection, applicants arguments are not persuavise because the claims read on 95% identical to a fragment of SEQ ID NO.2. Applicants amendment does not address this issue. Applicants argue that the art does not describe the function of the encoded product. This is not persuasive, the structure of the protein is met and as such the function of the protein is met absent convincing evidence to the contrary.